

## **REMARKS**

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the thin aqueous cataplasma is prepared by **only** laminating an adhesive layer on a support.

Similarly, claim 25 has been amended to recite a process for preparing a thin aqueous cataplasma, wherein the process **consists of** the recited steps.

Support for these amendments is found in the Examples of Applicant's specification.

### **Patentability Arguments**

The patentability of the present invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the following remarks.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8, 11, 16, 19, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mooney et al. (US 5,814,031) in view of Muta et al. (US 6,432,431). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the previous two responses, Applicant has provided arguments that "the dressing of Mooney has a porous cover as an essential component". Please see the comments provided in the response of October 20, 2009.

The Examiner has maintained the position that "the instant claims do not exclude the presence of such a cover... [but] only limit the particular support and adhesive layer."

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's position, for the reasons provided in the paragraph spanning pages 8 and 9 of the response filed March 5, 2010. However, in order to advance prosecution of the present application, and as noted above, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite a thin aqueous cataplasma prepared by **only** laminating an adhesive

layer on a support. Accordingly, the claims now clearly exclude the presence of a porous cover in the cataplasma.

Thus, for the reasons provided above, as well as the arguments of record in support of the patentability of the presently claimed invention over the cited references, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present claims are patentable over the cited combination of references. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the ground of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Sadanobu SHIRAI

/Amy E. Schmid/  
By 2010.11.22 10:55:15 -05'00'

Amy E. Schmid  
Registration No. 55,965  
Attorney for Applicant

AES/cbc  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 22, 2010